

**FALLBROOK COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP**

Regular Meeting

Monday, September 15, 2008, 7:00 PM, Live Oak School, 1978 Reche Road, Fallbrook  
**MINUTES**

**RECEIVED**

San Diego County

DEPT. OF PLANNING & LAND USE

Meeting called to order at 7:00 PM by Chair Jim Russell, who led the assembly in the Pledge of Allegiance. 15 members were present, Bill Bopf, Jim Bowen, Anne Burdick, Harry Christiansen, John Crouch, Eileen Delaney, Tom Harrington, Carolyn Major, Ron Miller, Jim Oenning, Ike Perez, Mary Jane Pfeil, Jim Russell, Chuck Sanacore and Paul Schaden.. Maryanne Vancio of County P&R attended.

**Announcements :**

1. Open Forum. Opportunity for members of the public to speak to the Planning Group on any subject matter within the Group's jurisdiction but not on today's agenda. Three minute limitation. Non-discussion and non-voting item.

Gerald Walson discussed the schedule for permit approvals and construction for SR 76 widening from the present 4-lane terminus to I-15. The first construction phase will be the erection of a second parallel bridge over the San Luis Rey River.

2. Approval of the minutes for the meeting of 18 August 2008. Voting item. Chuck Sanacore moved to approve the minutes as presented. Motion was approved unanimously.

3. TM5354RPL3/R04-004/GPA04-002/SP04-001/S04-005/S04-006/S04-007/P08-023 (MEADOWOOD) Request to subdivide the 390 acres located east of I-15 and north of State Route 76 between the Passarelle project and the Rosemary Mountain project. It is also a request for a General Plan Amendment (GPA), a Rezone (R), and a Specific Plan Amendment (SP) Vesting Tentative Map and a Site Plan Review plus a Major Use Permit for a wastewater treatment facility and a TM for the development of 858 dwelling units. Owner/Applicant Pardee Homes, Karen Kosup & Jimmy Ayala (858) 794-2500. Contact person David Sibbet 858-751-0634. County planner Dennis Cameron dennis.cameron@sdcounty.ca.gov. Project denied at the 15 March 2004, 19 December 2005 and 18 June 2007 FCPG meetings. **Land Use, Design Review, and Parks & Recreation Committees.** Community input. Voting item. (5/8).

Jimmy Ayala and Alan Zieghas of Pardee Homes described the present application as contrasted with previous applications, using a series of display boards depicting the overall plan for the development, the trails for the development and examples of the various homes that are being proposed for the development. The proposal now calls for 858 homes in three distinctive neighborhoods, a reduction of 192 homes from the most recent plan.

The project is 390 acres, of which 45.1 acres are agricultural preserve with 5 acres existing in the middle of the development. 128 acres are natural open space to be preserved. There are 10 acres of neighborhood parks. Trees at the south end of the development have been eliminated to accommodate the proposed sewage treatment plant which was previously located off site.

The overall development consists of 5 areas: Area 1 - 178 detached condominiums; Area 2 - the elementary school; Area 3 - a ten-acre park; Area 4 - 325 multifamily town homes; and Area 5 - 325 single family homes on 6,000 SF lots. The school area, Area 2, has been expanded from 10 acres to 12.7 acres. Park area 3 is now expanded to 10 acres.

Jimmy Ayala pointed out that the eastern edge of the development will follow the contours of the natural grade; the plan includes 45.1 acres of agricultural open space; 128 acres of natural open space, a 10-acre park and four pocket parks. Housing will be pulled back from the steepest slopes.

The three distinct neighborhoods being proposed are:

Area 1 - the "cluster product" will contain 1400-1900 SF homes with 475 parking spaces. Committee members expressed concerns about where the parking spaces are located and the inadequacy of the number of spaces for the 178 detached condos.

Area 4 - is the Townhome section of 1-3 bedroom units of 900-1300 SF. Garages will be in the alleys with four units facing another four units. The front side of the units will have a 20' grass area between them.

Area 5 - is the single family home area with 325 units and 882 parking spaces. The homes will be 2200-3000 SF on 6,000SF lots with 20' x 20' garages.

The Project is 390 acres.. 45.1 acres are agricultural preserve with 5 acres existing in the middle of the development. 128 acres are natural open space to be preserved. There are 10 acres of neighborhood parks. Trails are around the perimeter and some private trails are located within the development. The private trails will be HOA maintained There are 4 miles of multi-use trails within the site. Trails will be decomposed granite. Mr. Ayala stated the development is similar to one in Carmel Valley and that the highest priority of amenities from the residents was for trails and pathways. The proponents stated that they have found that having trails and pathways in their developments is very important as it enhances the community and helps to sell the units. Trees at the south end of the development have been eliminated to accommodate the proposed sewage treatment plant which was previously located off site.

Pocket parks will be for the immediate neighbors with no parking and no amenities. There will be 40 parking spaces at the 10 acre park. Amenities are being developed for this park. Pathways out of the housing area will be landscaped if out of the natural areas. Trail surfaces were discussed; trail surface can be 90 % compacted. They will work with Public Works to meet the County standard.

Land Use Committee commended some features described, such as the larger school site, the larger park area and the reduction in number of homes, but were not satisfied with the general lack of improvement reported. Nothing in the project creates long term jobs. The transit node should be located adjacent to the highway to do much good. Infrastructure failures stand out, like the lack of assured water supply (part of the site is outside the Metropolitan Water boundary., lack of sewage treatment until there is an assured system operator, the illustrated location and route of the road from the "Bridge to Nowhere, and need for a diamond intersection at Canonita Road and I-15. On-site parking is insufficient and often poorly located, making it awkward for residents. The Committee had discussed the school site, within the Bonsall District vs other sites in the quadrant, the school district boundaries and how students from south of SR76 will cross the highway to/from school. The Committee voted to continue the project.

Design Review Committee also found parking in the home areas poor and not situated correctly Guest parking is particularly poor, and the shared driveways are poor. They suggest more 3-car garages. They want architectural information, including for the recreational Center. They moved to continue the project for 60 days to allow Pardee to make project improvements.

Parks & Recreation Committee was pleased with the trails layout but not happy with the few small parks which Pardee had offered. It was recommended that Pardee show a more detailed parks layout, and the parks amenities that would be available to residents. A few specific requests were made re trails. They passed a two part motion, to 1) Recommend approval of the trails plan as presented with the following conditions: a. include a connecting trail on east rear side of school site. b. All trails to be coordinated with the County trails coordinator. c. Use of liquid stabilizer applied to DG recommended, and to 2) Continue the park location issue for 60 days to give proponent time to present more specifics, to include recreation amenities and club house amenities.

Paula Oenning visited the Pardee project at Lake Elsinore, and found it poor in many respects. Monty Voigt said they need more pocket parks, and dedicated trails, plus walking routes off the roads, and the garages are too small. Gerald Walson found that at Lake Elsinore the parking is inadequate and the cul-

de-sacs became parking lots. \_\_\_\_\_ asked whether this amount of housing should be placed next to an active quarry. Sheila Walson questioned the potential number of student in the three Ps areas. Jimmy Ayala replied to comments: the trails will occupy 4.2 acres, parking problems are being studied.

Jim Russell began the Planning Group discussion, commenting that he is disheartened and disappointed with the current proposal. He suggested site adaptive grading rather than mass grading, to move less dirt and better retain the native gradients. 6000 SF lots are still too small, the smallest anywhere in Fallbrook. Harry Christiansen said after 5 years of study, this is still too crowded. We had estimated a maximum yield of about 650 homes in consideration normal yield loss for things such as slopes and infrastructure. One way to improve the parking problem is to reduce the number of homes. He handed out copies of minutes of the past three proposals by Pardee for this site, and pointed out that Pardee had made minimal effort to solve our questions, and to improve their product. The school site at their Lake Elsinore project is 30 acres and is too small. Many students are bussed several miles. The minimum home site there is 7800 SF, average lot is ~10,000 SF. Guest parking there is fully packed with trucks. He then passed out and read the following motion to deny the project as presented. The motion to deny was unanimously approved, as follows:

*This Planning Group has consistently been opposed to this proposed project, as is well documented by our Minutes of March 15, 2004, December 15, 2005, and June 15, 2007. Appropriate excerpts of all these Minutes are attached, and are considered to still be relevant in explaining our opposition.*

*In spite of all our opposition, stated both formally and informally, the proponent has made only minimal changes in their proposal. The proponent has apparently not paid any attention to our valid objections, and the present proposal is substantially the same as it was in June, 2007.*

*We find the issue of inadequate parking in the two multi-family areas to be extreme examples of the proponent's unwillingness to develop a reasonably decent living environment for future owners and occupants.*

*We have been willing to look at density increases so long as the proposed plans appear to fit reasonably well "on the ground". Unfortunately, the proponent seems simply interested in increasing the number of dwelling units – regardless of how badly they might impact the future inhabitants.*

*The proponent is now pushing hard to get their project approved without considering the cumulative impact of the other projects proposed in the area. They have been consistently told they must work together to provide for the facilities and infrastructure needed for their cumulative impacts on the community.*

*The only joint-planning shown in the current proposal is that the area's proposed developers have jointly decided to move (to the extreme south) the connecting road between the Pala Mesa / Hwy 395 bridge and the center of their combined projects (including the new college). This was decided purely to reduce their costs, and is unacceptable to the community.*

*Further processing of the proponent's Draft Environmental Impact Report must be stopped until the proponent, and their developer neighbors, have adequately addressed all the issues related to their planning and the possible effects. The proponent seems satisfied to ignore and skip over the planning issues, and go straight to the EIR process – where they hope to prevail.*

*The Planning Group's area of authority does not include providing for available water and sewer services, so any development of the subject property necessarily depends upon the proponent's ability to find and provide for those services.*

6. TM5354/R04-004/GPA04-02/SP04-01/S04-005/S04-006/S04-007 (MEADOWWOOD) Request to subdivide the 390 acres located east of I-15 and north of State Route 76 between the Passarelle project and the Rosemary Mountain project. This project includes development of 393 single family detached, 124 single family alley, 83 single family cluster and 644 multi family dwelling units, an elementary school, six private parks, four miles of trails, associated community facilities and infrastructure as well as permanent preservation of 125.3 acres of open space lands and 56.8 acres of agriculture lands. Owner William Pankey 743-0108. Applicant Pardee Homes Charles Corum (858) 794-2500. Point of contact Randi Coopersmith (858) 751-0633. County planner Marette Esperance (858)-694-2969. **Land Use, Circulation & Parks & Recreation Committees.** Community input. Voting item.

Three standing committees discussed this project. Appropriate text from their committee minutes is included italicized in these minutes.

Chuck Corum, VP of Pardee Homes spoke first. Pardee has applied to the County of San Diego for a number of documents or approvals, including a Tentative Map, a Rezone, a General Plan Amendment, an SPA, and others. Their total project is to cover 1244 living units. They hope for overall approval in 2006, to start grading in 2007 and to open sample residences in 2008. Their project will have only a school building in addition to the residential units; no retail or recreational facilities. Randi Coopersmith described the design objectives and layout. They propose no ridgeline construction. Land near the ridgeline will be kept as a buffer. The property loops around the Rosemary's Mountain quarry site. They will leave 182 acres in dedicated Open Space. The entrance is about 0.9 miles from I-15 Highway. This 0.9 of a mile will be relocated and widened to 4 lanes by the quarry project. Pankey Road will be the major access to Meadowood and Passerelle and will be relocated. They believe that SR 76 west of I-15 is outside their responsibility.

The Land Use Committee report is in two parts. The italicized paragraph which follows is the report from the Land Use Committee, followed then by additional comments by Committee Chair Harry Christiansen.

*Before the meeting, members and members of the public took a tour of sites for item number 5. This visit was a tour of the site directed by Randi Coopersmith and others of his staff. Mr. Coopersmith continued from the site visit and described the maps he used. 6 mini-parks are proposed, but the project will still need to contribute to the Park Land Dedication Ordinance fund. There will be no gated areas. An elementary school is proposed in the part of the project which is within the Bonsall School District. No commercial area is proposed. All this property is outside the County Water Authority. Meadowood seems to have moved the development line further east than had been proposed by DPLU for Plan 2020. They are asking for an overall rezone. They plan for a number of 3 story condo/apartment buildings. The committee discussed a number of features of the project but took no action.*

*The Pardee representatives had to leave early. A brief discussion followed which was limited to clarifying various parts of the presentation with a specific intention of not expressing any opinions. Jim Oenning (760-451-2323), a resident of Rancho Viejo spoke as a member of the public.*

Mr. Christiansen commented that nearly all of the lots are smaller than the smallest anywhere in Fallbrook, mentioning specific sizes. The 11.8 acres allotted for a school seems too small to allow for any athletic or recreational use or parking for participation or observation. Pardee seems to have extended their project east from the development line established by the 2020 staff. Much of the so-called Open Space is really not buildable. They are building in an area designated as a Transportation Node, but with no sign of bus or rail station or even park-ride lots. The entire property is outside the County Water Authority line. This line can be moved, but that does not assure that there is an adequate water supply. The parking spaces barely comply with appropriate ordinances. This looks like a PRD, but without supplying any substantial amenities.

The Circulation Committee report is presented in the same two-part style, first from the Committee minutes and followed by comments from Chair Bill Bopf.

*Alan Ziegaus, Thomas Steinke, and Andy Schlaefli participated in presenting the Pardee proposal. The discussion was limited to circulation issues. They propose to widen and realign Pankey Road, partly within the Passerelle project. SR 76 will be widened to four lanes from the quarry to I-15. The housing projects may have to add another two lanes from their entrances to the freeway. Items of concern which were discussed include but not restricted to::*

- Number of trips south through Rancho Viejo via Dulin Road, which is a Circulation Element Road but is lined with homes and is not adequate for heavy traffic,*
- Circulation infrastructure should be in place to precede home construction or at least be committed for work as project construction proceeds.*

- Traffic concerns for following existing roads: Reche Road, Mission Road, Pala Mesa Road/ Wilt Road, SR 76, Old 395.
- Access to I-15 north and south. Need for another interchange..
- Action with the County of San Diego about traffic mitigation to which all projects along affected circulation routes would contribute. Reference was also made to Riverside County Ordinance Number 824, which imposes traffic development impact fees on all new construction,

No decisions were proposed or made.

Mr. Bopf commented that the Average Daily Trip (ADT) count in the Pardee report seemed low. However the ADT on SR 76 after all three projects are built out showed 33,000 trips. The same report showed 26, ADT leaving SR 76 south onto Dulin Road, a poor selection to get to anywhere. These figures show a need for a new interchange with I-15, probably at Canonita.

The Parks and Recreation Committee also addressed the Meadowood project. Their minutes are as follows:

*Representatives from Pardee Homes, Chuck Corum and Alan Ziegaus gave an overview of the Meadowood project. They stated that they are planning trails in a north/south direction at an unspecified location in their project. The trails would be multi-use for foot traffic and equestrians. They requested input from the committee for trails and parks. Currently there are 3.5 acres of parks planned. Trails are planned away from roads and near groves and natural open space. 50% of the project is projected to be open space and 4 miles of trails are planned. Gebhart asked them if a staging area for parks and picnics was planned. They stated that it is not planned. The trails are meant to be connectors to other county trails in a north/south direction.*

*Comella stated that more than 3.5 acres of parks are needed for the number of homes they are planning. Mr. Corum said Pardee is coordinating with the Passarelle project to co-use parks. They are open to suggestions for parks, however. Major showed them the Fallbrook Community Trails map and the County of San Diego trails map. The representatives from Pardee are willing to accommodate the connections with the County and Fallbrook community trails. Gebhart asked if they could use the grove roads for parks and trails. They said they would coordinate with the County to see what is feasible.*

*Freese asked if they are planning to dedicate the groves for permanent agriculture. They were not sure of the mechanism to do this but will research it. Kim Zuppiger, County Planner, suggested using the existing grove roads as trails. She will show them what the County requires. Maryanne Vancio, Trails Program Coordinator, suggested the roads could be used for dedicated trails. Also, they suggested that Pardee check with them before submitting trail plans.*

*Major stated that since the Pardee plan for trails and parks is not adequate for a project of this size, and is too vague, that there would be no vote taken. She asked Pardee to use the suggestions from this meeting to further their trails and parks plan for this project.*

Carolyn Major, P&R Committee chair, said the parks and recreational elements of the project seemed in a vacuum. The concept of trails connecting to other trails at the project border is fine, but the trail routes are not defined yet. The small area for neighborhood parks is inadequate. There is no space provided for ball or soccer fields or for adjoining parking.

Monte Voight spoke for the public, commenting on the housing density, and questioning the sewer capacity and where treatment will be done. He did not see any sidewalks along the project roads or the highway, and asked who will bear the responsibility for road and alley maintenance. Wallace Tucker asked whether the northeast area was to be "ag buffer" or "ag preserve". He said the application for the quarry had stated that the adjoining area would serve as acoustic buffer, but is now to be used for housing. This project looks like Temecula. Further, moving the CWA boundary would set a precedent. Jim Oenning said that this number of homes will all have to travel to Fallbrook just for milk and bread, since there is really no daily need shopping closer. Liz Yamaguchi pointed out the need for an archaeological study, since the first adobe home in the area was on the original land grant under a present grove building on the driveway to the Pankey home.the .

Randi Coopersmith replied that plans involving the buildout of the 3-project complex need fleshing out, such as the transportation node, sewers and water supply, and judgments should be reserved. Bob Sabus said there are too many homes, the need for a water supply is not assured and the Rosemary's Mountain quarry. Within a short distance would make this area relatively unlivable. John Crouch asked whether the units in the multi-family area near SR 76 would be rental or for sale. This is not yet determined. Bill Bopf said there are not large areas of multi-

family units in Fallbrook now, but they all have common areas. Amenities are lacking in this proposal. There will be too many vehicles and not enough parking space. Both Public Safety units ( North County Fire Protection District and San Diego County Sheriff) are understaffed, and response time to this area will be poor.

Harry Christiansen made a lengthy motion for denial. Chuck Corum objected, saying that Pardee was only making an informational presentation, with no decision expected tonight. Jim Russell replied that inclusion of the Tentative Map in this presentation makes an action mandatory, and that Pardee did not listen to comments made at an earlier presentation. Robert Green moved to amend the motion by deleting the last two items in Christiansen's motion. Bill Bopf suggested modifying wording, which was accepted by Green. . This amendment to the motion failed, with only 4 votes in favor. Christiansen's motion to deny approval of the project passed with 13 votes in favor and Robert Green abstaining. The entire motion follows, in bold type.

**Motion is to recommend denial and rejection of the proposed General Plan Amendment, Rezone, Tentative Map, and related applications in their entirety for the following general reasons:**

- **Residential Goal 3 in the Fallbrook Community Plan states "Grading, for residential development, should not unduly disrupt the natural terrain, or cause problems associated with runoff, drainage, erosion or siltation." The proposed 100 feet high cut slopes and 90 feet high fill slopes are prima facie evidence that the applicant has violated this requirement.**
- **Residential Goal 6 in the Fallbrook Community Plan states, "Planned developments which are sensitive to topographical restraints, and permit a more creative or imaginative development design than is generally possible through standard subdivisions should be encouraged." The extensive amount of grading proposed indicated that the applicant has ignored this requirement.**
- **Community Beautification and Design Goal 2 in the Fallbrook Community Plan states, "Adequate off-street parking should be provided for all types of vehicles in all new development." The proposed short front yard setbacks violates this requirement.**
- **Community Beautification and Design Goal 10 in the Fallbrook Community Plan states, "Development of steep slopes should be limited to agriculture and very low residential densities and clustering promoted in flatter areas." The extensive grading in the steeper slopes violates this requirement.**
- **The entire project lies outside of the area served by the Metropolitan Water District and the San Diego County Water Authority, and it seems unreasonable to add more water demands on an area that is ultimately facing a continuing water scarcity and shortage.**
- **This project and its neighboring projects are so large as to constitute a whole new town area, and the local highway and road infrastructure is incapable of handling the resulting traffic impacts. No development of this magnitude should be created until satisfactory road improvements are already in place. Proportionate, "fair share" mitigation contributions are completely inadequate to rectify the problems.**
- **The San Diego County 2020 Plan has suggested this general area should be developed with high residential density because it is a "Transportation Node". But, the proposed plan has no provision for a rail or bus transportation center, and there is no space identified for park & ride facilities – and the residential distances are too great for easy pedestrian access if such facilities were included.**
- **The 2020 land use of 14.5 dwelling units has already been objected to by the FCPG, which recommended maximum overall density of 4.5 dwelling units per acre.**
- **The area proposed by 2020 for this increased density is to the toe-of-the-slopes (within the 0 – 15% slope area) but the proposed project has greatly increased the development area up the hillsides. It has hundreds of homes outside of the 2020 development area, and includes homes up to 630 above sea level, which is some 300 feet higher than the general elevation limit proposed by the 2020 concept.**
- **This proposal is described as being the creation of a "community", but it consists of nothing more than a mass of overwhelming housing. There is a complete disregard for the group usable facilities that would be necessary for a "real" community.**

- The Condos/Apartments proposed for Area 1 have 500 units at a net density of 19.9 per acre. It has very limited recreational spaces, and primarily consists of 16 and 20 unit building blocks that have the appearance of barrack units. They include three story buildings, which are prohibited by Fallbrook zoning, and the parking provisions are totally inadequate.
- The minimum lot sizes proposed for Single Family Homes are unconscionable and violate the Fallbrook Community Plan. 47X85 and 50X105 foot lots with four foot side yards are too small for large two story homes.
- The so-called "alley product" single family homes have even smaller, minimum lot sizes of 37X85 feet.
- Front yard setbacks are so small that most homes do not even have "apron" parking in front of garages. Parking throughout the projects is completely inadequate given the propensity of people to use garages as storage space.
- Area 5 has 83 homes proposed at 8.8 DU's per acre in what appears to be a Planned Residential Development, but which does not have any amenities at all.
- The tiny parks that are proposed do not begin to meet any standards for a project of this size, and contributions to park funds don't add any benefit to this "community".
- The proposed 11.8 acre school site might be adequate for the school itself, but there is no provision for the amount of weekend automobile parking required for the kinds of playground usage that is common in our other schools.
- The traffic study is useless. It is obviously flawed in the projected amount and distribution of project-generated, off-site automobile travel. And, the projected build-out traffic in the area will absolutely strangle traffic on the west side of I-15, as well as on the east side.
- Substantial increases in traffic volume on Old 395 and other west-side local roads, together with access problems to and from the I-15 Freeway at both SR 76 and East Mission will adversely affect the quality of life in both Fallbrook and Bonsall on the west side of I-15. It appears likely that the coming traffic problems will require a "diamond" freeway interchange at Canonita.
- The proposed re-zone is a sham. The 92 acres presently included in the SPA study area contains substantially all of the developable land in this ownership. The additional 300 acres are proposed to be included in the re-zone in order to create home sites on the hills and to promote the illusion that the average density is only 3.2 DU's per acre. The claimed benefit of preserving Agricultural and Natural open spaces is unacceptable because the 300 acres are basically un-buildable. The present zoning is partly in Agricultural Preserve, and the general density is mostly one DU per 20 acres (because of slope factors). The 2020 proposed zoning is only one DU per 40 acres.
- The overall mass of this project makes a mockery of the I-15 design standards.
- In summary, this proposal is so bad that it should be entirely re-conceived and re-planned.

As noted above, this motion was accepted with 13 votes in favor and 1 (Robert Green) abstaining.

#### **EXCERPT FROM MINUTES OF FCPG MEETING ON DECEMBER 19, 2005**

6. TM5354RPL1/R04-004/GPA04-002/SP04-001/S04-005/S04-006/S04-007 (MEADOWOOD) Request to subdivide the 390 acres located east of I-15 and north of State Route 76 between the Passarella project and the Rosemarie Mountain project. It is also a request for a General Plan Amendment (GPA), a Rezone (R), and a Specific Plan Amendment (SP) Vesting Tentative Map and a Site Plan Review. This project includes development of 393 single family detached, 124 single family alley, 83 single family cluster and 644 multi family dwelling units, an elementary school, six private parks, four miles of trails, associated community facilities and infrastructure as well as permanent preservation of 125.3 acres of open space lands and 56.8 acres of agriculture lands. Owner William Pankey 743-0108. Applicant Pardee Homes Charles Corum (858) 794-2500. Point of contact Randi Coopersmith (858) 751-0633. County planner Alyssa Maxson 858-694-3737. Project denied at the 15 March 2004 FCPG meeting. Land Use, Circulation, Design Review & Parks & Recreation Committees. Community input. Voting item

Chuck Corum introduced Pardee's new proposal, and then had Randi Coopersmith explain it. They have reduced the number of dwelling units by 94, and relocated some specific housing areas. The entrance road and SR76 will be sheltered by citrus trees. A new several acre park area will be created at the high knoll. Grading was reduced by relocating several roads to follow contours. All construction will be well below the ridge line. Land Use Committee reported compliments for the improved

visual design, but found too many dwelling units. There is no assurance that Bonsall will choose to erect a school on the site; in which event the 13 acres will revert to housing and allow 200 + more high density units. No information was supplied on specific densities for multi-family unit areas. Committee has not had enough time to completely study the new design, since the County had not sent copies to us. Circulation Committee also has not received enough information yet, including the new traffic study. The developer needs to phase construction to the improvements needed in infrastructure. This remains a work in progress. Design Review had no new material to work with. Parks & Rec Committee said the park area is not sufficient. They find a need for both active and passive parks, with parking areas at the parks, and ask the developer to coordinate the trail routes with the Fallbrook Land Conservancy

Greg Latay (?) complained that this all dealt with only one of the three major projects in the area. Jennifer Jeffries gave thanks for the various committee reports. She recommended that the FCPG stick with the prior recommendation that Pardee be limited to 650 dwelling units and the other two developers share a total of 1,400 units. FCPG should hold the line at this total for the quadrant to protect the quality of life. Chris Hasvold said density is the main issue. Traffic will be excessive with dense housing and few jobs are in the immediate area. He also asked FCPG to stick with the 650 EDUs. Paul Reinke said this is not in compliance with 2020 as he understands it, and also recommended the 650 EDU max. Jim Tudor pointed out the Hewlett-Packard project had both housing and jobs on site, so traffic would have been less. Smart growth should be concentrated on the level land. Bud Swanson said the Rainbow Planning Group objected to a letter sent to most of the Rainbow residents asking support of Pardee, and said the Rainbow Planning Group voted unanimously to oppose the proposed zoning. David Allen asked why there should not be a notice about new material being available. Ree Tudor was amazed that Pardee did not come back with a 650 EDU proposal. Wallace Tucker commented on the small reduction of 94 EDUs and said if we can hold off long enough, the project may then become desirable. Stephen Rosenbaum said the real story is in the details, and recommended the 650 limit. Monte Voigt asked about waste water treatment, and asked whether the scenic groves might become commercial, or developed into high density housing. He recommended looking at all 3 projects as a whole. Bruce Thompson (candidate for Supervisor) said developers have some rights to develop property, but not to deteriorate the way of life. He supports Jennifer Jeffries recommendation for 650 EDUs.

Harry Christiansen said all the committees felt this proposal was an improvement, but was not nearly enough. The bulk of the change is in appearance but not in substance. A major problem is in Pardee counted the number of allowable units. He then made the following motion:

Motion is to recommend denial and rejection of the (revised) proposed General Plan Amendment, Rezone, Tentative Map, and related applications in their entirety for the following general reasons:

**The underlying premise for the revised plans is a sham.**

- In an effort to find some rational or legal basis for calculating the "allowable" number of dwelling units, the proponent has decided to designate the entire 390 acres owned by Mr. Pankey as a CUDA (available for current, near-term urban development) zone.
- This would allow the proponent to include ALL the property owned by Mr. Pankey in the calculation of total dwelling units to be allowed, in spite of the fact that 47% of the property has slopes in excess of 25%, and this land is not available for development according to the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO).
- The proponent then proposes to transfer the units claimed for the RPO area to be built in the lower-level portions of the property.
- The excessively-steep (RPO) slope area of the combined properties includes 185 acres of otherwise un-buildable land up to and beyond the ridgeline easterly toward Rice Canyon Road.
- At the claimed "allowable" density of 2.95 dwelling units per acre, the un-buildable area adds 544 fictitious dwelling units to the proponent's total count. Removing this acreage from the calculation would reduce the total number of "allowable" dwelling units to 606.
- It is important to note that what the proponent is claiming in their calculation of "allowable" number of units is a self-serving plan created by this proponent for this project, and has no legitimate basis as a claim of an entitlement for this project or for this property.

The proponent's current plans do not sufficiently describe or explain the Plan Areas identified as being for Multi-family (attached or detached) units.

We still have serious problems with the small residential lot sizes, inadequate minimum building-setbacks, and the resulting overall impact of putting so many large homes on such a concentrated area.

Our objections to the original proposal are delineated in our denial motion of March 15, 2004, and are still substantially valid, and should be incorporated herein by reference.

This motion for denial was approved unanimously by the Fallbrook Community Planning Group.



## EXCERPT FROM MINUTES OF FCPG MEETING ON JUNE 18, 2007

4. TM5354RPL2/R04-004/GPA04-002/SP04-001/S04-005/S04-006/S04-007 (MEADOWOOD) Request to subdivide the 390 acres located east of I-15 and north of State Route 76 between the Passarelle project and the Rosemary Mountain project. It is also a request for a General Plan Amendment (GPA), a Rezone (R), and a Specific Plan Amendment (SP) Vesting Tentative Map and a Site Plan Review. This project includes development of 367 single family dwelling units and 500 multi-family dwelling units. Owner William Pankey 743-0108. Applicant Pardee Homes Jimmy Ayala (858) 794-2500. Contact person Alan Ziegau 858-541-7800 or Randi Coopersmith (858) 751-0633. County planner Christine Stevenson 858-694-3685. Project denied at the 15 March 2004 and 19 December 2005 FCPG meetings. **Land Use Committee.** Community input. Voting item. (4/24).

Jimmie Ayala and Dave Sibbett represented the 390 acre project, with 121 acres of open space, 51 acres remaining in groves 5.7 acres in trails and a 13 acre elementary school site. They have deleted one cul-de-sac and are defining parks with County DPR. Chuck Sanacore reported on the Land Use meeting, and Harry Christiansen said this is an improvement over the most recent plan, with housing reduced to 867 total units, increased lot sizes and a nice recreation center. He then described unsatisfactory design features in each of the three geographic areas.

Parking in the southerly multifamily area, while meeting County standards, is tight and inadequate, often not convenient for residents or visitors. Garages are too small for many current vehicle classes, with negligible apron space for short-term parking. Much guest parking is on-street. He read his proposed motion to deny, and made the motion. The next area to the north is planned for multi-family attached buildings, six in each row. Garages are beneath the homes, with no apron for temporary parking. The number of parking spaces and location thereof are again not adequate. There seems to be adequate recreational space and the rec. club is in this area. Further north and east is the area for single story single family homes on 6000 SF lots. The eastern part of this area has slope of up to 25%, more than the DPLU standard of 15% and is not satisfactory for homes.

Gerald Walson said we are elected to maintain the Fallbrook General Plan which exists. This plan does not comply in several respects, and makes no particular provisions for seniors. Sheila Walson said that Rainbow MWD has "suspended" Issuing water permits, and mentioned the DPLU letter to Valley Center disapproving them from annexing the local San Luis Water District. Monty Voigt talked about apparent lack of interest in modern features favoring the environment. Examples are extensive use of solar energy recovery and use of recycled water. Ayala said that Pardee might supply up to 20% of homes with solar recovery, and that the option to so equip would be offered to other buyers.

Bill Bopf said traffic on SR76 will be at the unsatisfactory level "E", and the cumulative effect of this and other significant projects must be assessed before any approvals are given. Jim Oenning felt the type of purchasers will have too many children for the one school proposed. Jim Russell added one more clause regarding cumulative traffic to Christiansen's motion.

### *MOTION REGARDING MEADOWOOD 6-18-07*

*Recommend rejection and denial of project as presented for the following reasons:*

- 1. Proponent claims that their proposal is in accordance with GPA 2020, but this is not correct for several reasons:*
  - The proposed subdivision has 347 single family detached homes in Areas 5 and 6, and extends up the property into areas with average slopes in excess of 15%. This does not conform to restrictions set by the 2020 Plan or the Resource Protection Ordinance.*

- Densities proposed in the various areas are in excess of those allowed in the 2020 Plan by either the DPLU Staff or the FCPG.
- The Proponent's application of the "clustering" concept is entirely wrong. The proper use of clustering is to concentrate buildings within part of the buildable area of the property, and to preserve the balance of the buildable area as open space. The Proponents method is to claim that ALL of the buildable area is the clustering part of the property – and the unbuildable part of the property is the "preserved open space". Their subterfuge allows for the creation of an excessive number of dwelling units.

2. Plan Area #1 is proposed to have 174 multi-family, detached homes, which are basically arranged in groups on individual, condo lots. They have too many lots (and groups) and too few parking places.

- The typical group has eight homes: two on each side of the entrance driveway and four at the rear of the driveway. The four homes fronting on the entrance driveway do not have parking aprons in front of their garages, and there is no parking within the lots for those homes, except inside the garages.
- Two parking places (all in the garages) are provided for each home, but there is no provision for additional vehicles of the residents except within the so-called guest parking areas.
- Guest parking is only provided on the streets (not within the groups), but the specific locations are inconvenient for use by residents and guests. The total amount of guest parking appears to be in excess of County standards, but the residents will be forced to use many of those places.
- The garages are all 20x20 which is too small for many SUVs and Pickup Trucks, and there is very limited space for storage.
- There are no apparent locations for such things as trash collecting.

3. Plan Area # 4 proposes 326 multi-family, attached units which are arranged in a configuration of attached, two-story townhouses, with entrances on one side of each building and the garages located inside the houses on the other side of the buildings.

- Most of the garages are entered through an alley, but some are entered directly from the streets. The garages do not have parking aprons, so there is no space for outside parking.
- The garages are all too small (approximately 20x20) for many vehicle models, so many vehicles will have to find outside parking. This will be especially important if the residents use all or part of their garages for storage, and furniture moving will be quite complicated.
- Any overflow of residents' parking will be forced into the guest parking areas, which are too few and too badly located for convenient use by either the residents or their guests.
- The only private outside spaces available to the residents are in small patches at the front side of each unit. These buildings are typically only twenty feet away from the opposing units, and this area is the only way for people to enter their front doors. There is really no room for toys, bikes, tables and chairs, or barbecuing.
- The alley / garage sides of the buildings will have the utilitarian appearance of a military barracks.

4. *The proposed school site appears to be too small (in comparison with the vehicle and parking needs of other newer schools).*
5. *The overall appearance of the project is that it is entirely too congested. We believe that if the project were to be built as presented it would potentially become an initially good-looking slum. We recommend that the proposed 847 dwelling units should be reduced by 25%, to about 650 total units.*
6. *This project must deal with the cumulative impacts of traffic on SR76 prior to approval.*

The motion as detailed above was approved unanimously.

4.. MUP03-127RPL1 Major Use Permit for Los Willows Inn and Spa, 728-8121 that would authorize use of the property for weddings and a confidence course on the 27.74 acres located at 530 Stewart Canyon Road, a private street. The applicant will be abandoning the previously proposed resort hotel and a spa. The applicant has closed the previously approved, via ZAP96-047, Bread & Breakfast. Contact person Wes Peltzer 744-7125, [wwpeltzer@aol.com](mailto:wwpeltzer@aol.com). County planner Curt Gonzalez 858-694-3696. Continued at the 18 Sept 2006 FCPG meeting. **Land Use Committee**. Community input. Voting item. (7/24)

Los Willows has just asked for this item to be continued to a later meeting. Chuck Sanacore so moved for continuance. Motion approved by 15 to 0.

5. TPM21110 Request to subdivide the 1.98 acres located at 244 North Stage Coach Lane, 693 feet south of the intersection with Gum Tree Lane into three lots for three dwelling units. The existing house to remain. The existing garage is now to be removed. Owner & applicant Robert Hudak 559-9049. Contact person Steve Lypps 728-1134. County planner Michelle Connors 858-694-2636. Project denied at the 21 Jan 2008 FCPG meeting. **Land Use Committee**. Community input. Voting item. (8/7).

Land Use visited the site again. Changes were minor, including removing the garage. Nonetheless the plot still included a cumbersome panhandle lot, with the panhandle toward Stage Coach to be used as a driveway for the middle lot. Motions were made to approve the subdivision as presented, and to deny it. Neither garnered a quorum vote. The engineer asked to remove the project from the monthly PG agenda. Tom Harrington moved to continue the project. His motion was approved unanimously.

6. Discussion on the Fallbrook Community Plan Text for the New General Plan for San Diego County. In a series of several meetings in 2002/2003 the Fallbrook Community Planning Group in conjunction with community participants rewrote the Fallbrook Community Plan Text for the New General Plan. The county Department of Planning and Land Use (DPLU) has created a "template" for Updating Community Plans. Fallbrook has two options;

- a. Go with the Fallbrook Community Plan Text that we created in 2002/2003.
  - b. Create a new Plan using the "Template" created by DPLU. Must be completed by Fall of 2009.
- Community input. Voting item.

Jim Russell said the Planning Group had held at least 16 special meetings with DPLU Staff and interested citizens to develop the Community Plan Text referred to above. The new format is much more extensive and would be a very intensive, time-consuming task. Harry Christiansen brought out several features of the new style which may well be desired if not required within the expected life of the new County-wide plan. It was acknowledged that the DPLU Staff is overloaded with present assignments and would be of little help to us. Tom Harrington moved to select Option a, the text already developed. Motion received 13 votes in favor and 2 opposed (Harry Christiansen and John Crouch). Jim Russell will present this decision to the Update Staff, and inquire whether we can make any revisions to features of the text. (There are several paragraphs requiring inclusion of data).

7. Discussion on the County Trails and Pathways Master Plan vis-à-vis Fallbrook. Contrary to the information presented to Fallbrook;

- a. Dedication and construction of Trails and Pathways is not voluntary. While the County Trails Master Plan states that both are voluntary the county subdivision ordinance was modified to require mandatory participation for any of the following:
  1. Major Use Permits (except those for Time Extensions) and Major Use Permit Modifications.
  2. Open Space Easements and Vacations.
  3. Reclamation Plans.
  4. Road Vacations.
  5. Site Plans (except those for Model Homes, Time Extensions and one Single-Family Residence) and Site Plan Modifications.
  6. Specific Plans and Specific Plan Amendments.
  7. Tentative Maps/Major Subdivisions (except those for Condominium Conversions and Time Extensions), Revised Maps and Expired Maps.
  8. Tentative Parcel Maps/Minor Subdivisions (except those for Condominium Conversions and Time Extensions), Revised Maps and Expired Maps.
- b. There is no waiver process.

The county Parks and Recreation Department have inserted the Fallbrook J-36 document into the Trails Plan as a part of the Fallbrook Community Trails Plan. County planner Maryanne Vancio, 858-966-1372 [maryanne.vancio@sdcountry.ca.gov](mailto:maryanne.vancio@sdcountry.ca.gov). Community input. Discussion only, Non-voting item.

Maryanne Vancio stated that the agenda item is incorrect wherein it states that dedication and construction of trails is not voluntary. Trails are voluntary by private property owners on private roads unless an owner files a discretionary permit with the County which indicates a subdivision or other development. Then the developer who files the discretionary permit is subject to placement of trails at or near his development if shown on the Trails Map and if connectivity to other trails is an issue. The County Trails Program was originally adopted as a voluntary program but did not work. Trails offerings were nearly nil. Many meetings and studies have shown that communities want trails and pathways connecting throughout. The County stated they would absorb any liability for damages when trails and pathways were planned in the communities. Tom Harrington passed out a statement prepared by the Department of General Services with support from DPLU and DPR to clarify some guidelines in implementing the current trail requirements for discretionary projects in the Fallbrook area. The County has adopted the Fallbrook J-36 street standards in connection with the Community Trails Master Plan (CTMP) and is working to make the CTMP trail width to agree with the J-36 standard. Tom and Maryanne explained that there are ways to get waivers from details of the CTMP. Wallace Tucker spoke about the importance of retaining the Fallbrook Trails Map. Donna Gebhart explained a short history of the Trails Map and its implementation. She spoke about the importance of trails and pathways connecting throughout Fallbrook for safety, health reasons and to maintain the rural feel of Fallbrook. Tom Marshall, a Fallbrook resident who has a home development he is doing in Riverside County, talked about the promise he has made to the buyers to develop pathways and trails in and around his project. He stated that this is what sells his project to potential buyers as this is why they want to live there.

8. TPM21135 Request to subdivide the 6.01 acres located at 2462 Gum Tree Lane into 4 lots plus a remainder. Owner and applicant GTBO LLC 604-1644. Contact person Thure Stedt 619-299-2525. County planner Ashley Gungle 858-495-5375. **Land Use and Circulation Committees.** Community input. Voting item. (8/14)

Land Use Committee visited the site, and noted that a home off site to the west is very close to the entry road which is located at the western border of this project. They recommended that the replacement paving for this road be located further to the east to move away from the existing home. This would have no effect on the new subdivision. The Circulation Committee also found the line-of-sight along Gum Tree Lane appears to be satisfactory. Chuck Sanacore moved to approve the subdivision as presented subject to moving the new roadway as far east within the right-of-way as possible.. This motion was approved by vote of 15 to 0.

9. Request for a Waiver of B Community Design Review Special Area Regulation for a 10' x 16' "Train" mural. Location of the mural will be on the south wall of the old North County Times building on the northwest corner of Main and Elder Streets. Contact person: Jerri Patchett for Art in Public Places. County planner is Debra Frischer [debra.frischer@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:debra.frischer@sdcounty.ca.gov). **Design Review Committee**. Community Input. Voting Item. (8/18)

The mural design is proposed as a memorial for the former railroad which ran close to the site of the building. The mural would be painted on panels which can be removed if the building is sold. Design Review has recommended approval of the waiver. Mary Jane Pfeil recommended identifying the railroad company on the mural (AT&SF). Eileen Delaney moved to approve the waiver. Motion was approved by vote of 15 to 0.

10. Request for a Waiver of B Community Design Review Special Area Regulation for banners announcing "Insiders Art Studio Tour" scheduled for Oct. 10-11th. Contact person: Don McDougal for Fallbrook Area Visitors Bureau [don@grandtradition.com](mailto:don@grandtradition.com) County planner is Debra Frischer [debra.frischer@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:debra.frischer@sdcounty.ca.gov). **Design Review Committee**. Community Input. Voting Item. (8/18)

Don McDougal was not present. Design Review Committee had discussed and approved of the temporary banners. Eileen Delaney moved to approve the waiver as requested. Her motion was approved unanimously.

11. P00-006W1 (Shady Grove AKA The Crest) Request for a Major Use Permit modification to change the architectural plans for the single family residences located at the south east corner of Stage Coach and Gum Tree Lanes. Owner & applicant KB Homes Coastal, Inc. 951-691-5257. Contact person Eric Scheck 951-691-5257. The request is to introduce three additional home types to the six home types already approved. The three additional home types are smaller in total square footage, single story, and will incorporate two new architectural themes (cottage and French Country). The three proposed floor plane will be 1,690, 1,997 and 2,275 SqFt. Of the 101 total lots, 40 homes (Lots 1 – 40) will be using the home types already approved. The remaining 61 homes, Lots 47-101 will be built using the proposed new home types. The applicant is also proposing three new model home sites on Lots 48 – 50. County planner Curt Gonzalez 858-694-3696. Continued at the 21 July FCPG meeting and no directions given at the 18 August 2008 FCPG meeting. **Design Review Committees**. Community input. Voting item. (8/27)

The Planning Group was reminded that there is no regulation that ANY project be reviewed by any committee. The project was reviewed by Design Review because the project was a MUP modification dealing only with architectural plans. Eileen Delaney summarized that the land use will remain the same, the type of dwelling units will remain the same and the circulation and roads will remain the same, She reported that the only changes reviewed were modifications to the architectural plans for single story homes.

Delaney reported that the Design Review Committee had met with the applicant at two committee meetings. At the first meeting they told the applicant that their plans did not appear to fit the character of the existing homes and they made numerous suggestions to the applicant. When the applicant returned to DR the next month, they had made significant changes to the proposed homes exteriors, architecture, rooflines, aesthetic features, and designs. The applicant also presented plans for an optional third car

garage, and they agreed to build a model with a third car garage. At this meeting the DR committee voted to approve the MUP modification.

There was extensive discussion about previous approvals of MU modifications. There was also discussion about parking, garages, and whether the PG could require larger homes and three car garages on all new homes. Bill Bopf moved to eliminate the smallest size house and accept the architectural changes and make the 3-car garage mandatory. This motion received only 5 positive votes and did not pass. Ike Perez moved to approve the MUP modification as presented with the revised architectural changes. The motion was approved with 9 positive votes.

12. Reappoint Jim Oenning to the I-15 Design Review Board for a second two year term. Community input. Voting item. This nomination was approved unanimously.

13. Response to a request from the San Diego County Department of Parks and Recreation for input from the FCPG to update the five-year park project priority list for the expenditure of Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) funds in Fallbrook. County contact Gustavo Godoy, 858-966-1343. **Parks & Recreation Committee.** Community input. Voting item.

Parks & Rec Committee made recommendations basis the list forwarded by County P&R Dept. They recommended deleting the park site south side of Fallbrook Street and west of Morro Road, and found the site at Santa Margarita Open Space is not eligible for PLDO funding as an active park. They also suggested considering the triangular site at Live Oak Park and East Mission Road, formerly owned by the Fallbrook Land Conservancy, be developed as a trailhead location. Carolyn Major moved the FCPG approve the same list. Motion was approved unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 PM

Jim Bowen, secretary

Cc:	DPLU	Nick Tartaglia	
		Cheryl Jones	Item 12
		Dennis Cameron	Item 3
		Curt Gonzales	Items 4, 11
		Michelle Connors	Item 5
		Eric Lardy	Item 6
		Ashley Gungle	Item 8
		Debra Frischer	Items 9, 10
	DPR	Maryanne Vancio	Item 7
		Gustavo Godoy	Item 13
	Fallbrook Chamber of Commerce		